

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA  
Richmond Division**

**MOMOLU V.S. SIRLEAF, SR.,**

Plaintiff,

v.

Civil Action No. **3:21CV234**

**JIMMY DOE, et al.,**

Defendants.

**MEMORANDUM OPINION**

Plaintiff, a Virginia inmate, has submitted this action and requested leave to proceed *in forma pauperis*. The pertinent statute provides:

In no event shall a prisoner bring a civil action [*in forma pauperis*] if the prisoner has, on 3 or more prior occasions, while incarcerated or detained in any facility, brought an action or appeal in a court of the United States that was dismissed on the grounds that it is frivolous, malicious, or fails to state a claim upon which relief may be granted, unless the prisoner is under imminent danger of serious physical injury.

28 U.S.C. § 1915(g). As Plaintiff is aware, he has at least three other actions or appeals that have been dismissed as frivolous or for failure to state a claim. *See, e.g., Sirleaf v. Harris*, No. 19–2520 (UNA), 2020 WL 2995015, at \*3 (D.D.C. June 3, 2020); *Sirleaf v. Northam*, No. 3:19CV182, 2019 WL 4247824, at \*5 (E.D. Va. Sept. 16, 2019) (placing Plaintiff on “notice that with this dismissal, he now has three strikes under § 1915(g)”); *Sirleaf v. McCabe*, No. 7:19CV00240 (W.D. Va. Mar. 18, 2019), *aff’d* No. 19–5423 (4th Cir. Aug. 21, 2019); *Sirleaf v. Mikeljohn*, No. 3:18CV562, 2019 WL 2251705, at \*10 (E.D. Va. May 24, 2019); *aff’d sub nom. Sirleaf v. Meiklejohn*, 777 F. App’x 700 (4th Cir. 2019). Plaintiff’s current complaint


does not suggest that he is in imminent danger of serious physical harm.<sup>1</sup> Accordingly, his request to proceed *in forma pauperis* will be DENIED. The action will be DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE.

To the extent that he wishes to bring a claim solely on his own behalf, Plaintiff remains free to submit a new complaint with the full \$402 filing fee. The Court will process such a complaint as a new civil action.

An appropriate Order shall accompany this Memorandum Opinion.

It is so ORDERED.

Date: April 29, 2021  
Richmond, Virginia

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
M. Hannah Lauck  
United States District Judge

---

<sup>1</sup> To the contrary, Plaintiff again attempts to bring an action on behalf of a child, which the Court has already warned him more than once that he may not do. *See, e.g., Sirleaf*, 2019 WL 2251705, at \*2–6.